



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,493	04/12/2004	Christopher Ronnewinkel	13906-205001 / 2004P00207	3022
32864 7590 09/20/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER MADAMBA, GLENFORD J	
			ART UNIT 2151	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/822,493

Applicant(s)

RONNEWINKEL, CHRISTOPHER

Examiner

Glenford Madamba

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/07, 4/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Subramaniam, U.S. Patent US 7,233,937.

As per Claims 1 and 15, Subramaniam discloses a method of defining a system for responding to an incoming electronic message (IEM) [Abstract], the method comprising:

defining a categorization scheme having a plurality of hierarchically organized categories [col 8, L36-55] (e.g., creating/defining one or more Search Category Objects) [Figs. 6, 15, 34, 35 & 39] (e.g., catalog and category levels in the hierarchy) [col 26, L23-40];

linking stored information to each defined category (i.e., Category Item Link 3820) [Fig. 38]; and

providing multiple response procedure modules, each of which, when executed under user control, uses the stored information that is linked to a selected one of the defined categories, wherein the selected category is determined by analyzing the content of the IEM [col 2, L55-67] [col 33, L48 – col 34, L3] [col 17, L57 – col 18, L3] (e.g., Search Results) [col 16, L6-45] [Fig. 22, 27-29, 40-43, 47].

As per claim 2, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the stored information comprise business objects (i.e., 'business objects') [Fig. 1] [col 5, L38-48].

As per claim 3, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the business objects comprise quick solutions (e.g., Solutions) [Fig. 25] [col 2, L58-67] [col 16, L33-45].

As per claim 4, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the business objects comprise experts (agent / customer support personnel) [col 33, L49-50].

As per claim 5, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the business objects comprise response templates (i.e., templates 340) [Fig. 3].

Art Unit: 2151

As per claim 6, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the defined system performs a business process (i.e., business process) [col 1, L24].

As per claim 7, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the business process comprises an email response management system (i.e., email response) [col 1, L50-56 & L57] [col 2, L40-50].

As per claim 8, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the system comprises a contact center (e.g., interaction / call center) [col 2, L11-55].

As per claims 9 and 16, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the system comprises an interaction center (e.g., interaction / call center) [col 2, L11-55].

As per claim 10, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein at least one of the multiple response procedures performs a step of responding to the IEM (i.e., email response) [col 1, L50-56 & L57] [col 2, L40-50].

As per claim 11, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the IEM is an email (i.e., "email / email response") [col 1, L50-56 & L57] [col 2, L40-50].

As per claim 12, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the IEM is received via Internet self-service (i.e., Self-help Model) [col 1, L64-67].

As per claim 13, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the categorization scheme is hierarchical and has at least two levels of categories (i.e., hierarchical data structure) (parent / one or more child property sets) [col 15, L64 – col 16, L5] [col 26, L24-40].

As per claim 14, Subramaniam discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising defining queries for each category (e.g. Search Definition Category) [Fig. 21], wherein analyzing the content of the IEM involves evaluating defined queries (i.e. Search Query 3520) [Fig. 35] to select categories for which the corresponding defined queries match the content of the IEM [col 2, L55-67] [col 33, L48 – col 34, L3] [col 17, L57 – col 18, L3] [Fig. 22, 27-29, 40-43, 47].

As per claim 17, Subramaniam discloses the computer program product of claim 15, wherein at least one of the response procedure modules, when executed, performs a step in an ERMS business process (i.e., email response / business process) [col 1, L24] [col 2, L50-52].

As per claim 18, Subramaniam discloses the computer program product of claim 17, wherein at least one of the response procedure modules, when executed, performs a

Art Unit: 2151

step other than a step in an ERMS business process (e.g., supply chain, back-office operations, CRM) [col 1, L20-25].

As per claim 19, Subramaniam discloses a computer-implemented system for defining a system for responding to an incoming electronic message (IEM), the computer-implemented system comprising:

a graphical user interface capable of defining categorization schemes to have a plurality of hierarchically organized categories and of linking stored information to each defined category (Search Center User Interface) [col 20, L14] [Figs. 26-32]; and

multiple response procedure modules, each of which, when executed under user control, uses the stored information that is linked to a selected one of the defined categories, wherein the selected category is determined by analyzing the content of the IEM [col 2, L55-67] [col 33, L48 – col 34, L3] [col 17, L57 – col 18, L3] (e.g., Search Results) [col 16, L6-45] [Fig. 22, 27-29, 40-43, 47].

Conclusion

1. The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It

Art Unit: 2151

is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Sternemann
Method for Processing Data Objects


Patent No.: US 7085772 B1

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Wallace Martin can be reached on 571-272-3440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Glenford Madamba
Examiner
Art Unit 2151